

REMARKS

Claim Objections and Rejections

Claim 1 has been cancelled. Claims 2-18 are pending. Claims 2, 3, 6-9, 11, and 12 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Reexamination and reconsideration of this application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner objected to claim 6 as depending from rejected base claim 1, but indicated that claim 6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, incorporating all limitations of rejected base claim 1. Per the Examiner's suggestion, claim 6 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 1. Claim 6 has also been amended to correct the antecedent basis of its limitations. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to claim 6 is obviated.

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 for containing improper antecedent basis. Claims 1-3, 7-10, 13, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by "Simon's Owners Manual" ("Simon"). Claims 4, 5, and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Simon in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,000 to Tsui ("Tsui"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 Rejections

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 for containing improper antecedent basis. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that both claims recite the term "the another device" for which the antecedent basis is improper. Applicants have amended claim 11 to correct the antecedent basis and note that claim 12 has been amended to depend from claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 has been obviated and should therefore be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejections

Claims 2, 3, 7-10, 13, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Simon. The Examiner alleged that Simon discloses a method for user with a device that has a plurality of actions, such as communicating with a central monitoring station and sounding a siren. The Examiner further alleged that at least some of the actions comprise a response to external stimuli such as panel beeps or panel voices. The Examiner

also argued that Simon discloses voicing a name for each sensor in an open condition, and the identification of specific external stimuli.

The Examiner further argued that Simon discloses a receiver means for receiving wireless communications, responding to at least some of the wireless communications with a corresponding control action, and diagnostic means operably coupled to the receiver means and an audio transducer means for ascertaining information regarding a source of a given wireless communication.

With respect to claims 2, 3, and 7-9, Applicants note that each of these claims have been amended to depend (directly or indirectly through claim dependencies) from amended claim 6 which, as discussed above, has been rewritten in independent form per the Examiner's suggestion. In the October 5, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claim 6, if rewritten in independent form, would be allowable because the cited references do not disclose the "providing a first unique audible signal ...; providing a second unique audible signal ...; and providing a third unique audible signal ..." limitations. Therefore, claims 2, 3, and 7-9 readily distinguish over Simon for at least the same reasons as those discussed above with respect to claim 6.

Claim 10 recites (with emphasis added):

"10. A device comprising:
- receiver means for receiving **wireless communications**;
- audio transducer means for providing a plurality of audible signals;
- control means operably coupled to the receiver means for:
- receiving wireless communications;
- responding to at least some of the wireless communications with a corresponding control action;
- **diagnostic means operably coupled to the receiver means and the audio transducer means for:**
- **ascertaining information regarding a source of a given wireless communication; and**
- **causing provision of at least one audible signal to uniquely characterize information regarding a source of a given wireless communication independent of any control action as may also be included with the given wireless communication."**

The Examiner stated that Simon discloses a "receiver means for receiving wireless communications (see page 4); ... [and] diagnostic means operably coupled to the receiver means and [an] audio transducer means for: ascertaining information regarding a source of a

given wireless communication (panel identifies from which sensors information is being received, see sensor open condition [on] page 14)". [Office Action, page 4.]

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of Simon. Specifically, the wireless communication to which the Examiner refers on page 4 is performed with a "Touchtalk 2-Way RF touchpad" that the user can carry and utilize to "control the security system primarily from within the home." [Simon, page 4.] However, Simon does not disclose, teach, or suggest use of a diagnostic means for **ascertaining information regarding a source of a given wireless communication and causing provision of at least one audible signal to uniquely characterize information regarding a source of a given wireless communication independent of any control action as may also be included with the given wireless communication.**

There is no reason for the system in Simon to ascertain information regarding a source of a wireless communication because such source is already known – it is the RF touchpad. Moreover, there would therefore be no reason to provide at least one audible signal to uniquely characterize information regarding a source of a given wireless communication. Applicants further note that use of only one RF touchpad is shown on page 4, and there would therefore be no reason for the providing of at least one audible signal regarding the source of the wireless communication.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 readily distinguishes over Simon. Claims 11-18 all depend (directly or indirectly through claim dependencies) from claim 10 and therefore also readily distinguish over Simon for at least the same reasons as those discussed above with respect to claim 10.

Moreover, claims 11 and 12 further distinguish over Simon. Specifically, claim 11 recites (with emphasis added): "[t]he device of claim 10 wherein **the control action directly operates on another device comprising a movable barrier operator.**" The alarm system described in Simon does not operate on any such movable barrier operator. Accordingly, claim 11 further distinguishes over Simon. Claim 12 directly depends from claim 11 and therefore also further distinguishes over Simon for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 11.

Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 2, 3, 7-10, 13, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be withdrawn.

§103(a) Rejection (claims 4, 5, and 14-16)

Claims 4, 5, and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious given Simon in view of Tsui. The Examiner alleged that Simon discloses nearly every limitation recited in claims 4, 5, and 14-16 except for the transmission from a remote control transmitter that includes a rolling code. However, the Examiner argued that Tsui discloses use of a transmitter using a rolling code, and that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Simon and Tsui in the direction of claims 4, 5, and 14-16.

Applicants note that claims 4 and 5 indirectly depend from claim 6 and therefore distinguish over Simon for at least the same reasons as those discussed above with respect to claim 6. Claims 14-16 indirectly depend from claim 10 and therefore distinguish over Simon for at least the same reasons as those discussed above with respect to claim 10. Tsui fails to make up for the deficiencies of Simon. Specifically, Tsui contains no disclosure directed to providing three different unique audible signals in response to determining that an external stimuli is either not recognized, includes an identifier that includes a rolling code, or includes an identifier that includes a fixed code. Moreover, Tsui also fails to disclose providing of at least one audible signal regarding the source of a wireless communication.

Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 4, 5, 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance, and a favorable action is respectfully requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Chicago telephone number (312) 577-7000 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance should the Examiner believe that such a telephone conference would advance prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

By: James M. Wakely
James M. Wakely
Registration No. 48,597

Date: January 5, 2005

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY
Suite 1600
120 South LaSalle
Chicago, Illinois 60603-3406
Telephone: (312) 577-7000
Facsimile: (312) 577-7007